IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

1981 TERM

NO. 81 5143

RECEIVED
JUL 28 1981
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

MILLICENT LINDEN,

Appellant,

- v -

DIAL PRESS and OLGA LEY
HARPER and ROW PUBLISHERS, INC.
ST. MARTIN'S PRESS and SIDI HESSEL

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

ON APPEAL FROM THE COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

Millicent Linden
Appellant, Pro Se
500 East 74th Street
New York, N.Y. 10021

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

NO. 81 5143

MILLICENT LINDEN,

Appellant,

- v. -

DIAL PRESS and OLGA LEY
HARPER and ROW PUBLISHERS, INC.
ST. MARTIN'S PRESS and SIDI HESSEL

RECEIVED
JUL 28 1981
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

ON APPEAL FROM THE COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

Appellant appeasl from the orders of the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, affirming the order of the administrative Judge of the United States District Court fo the Southern District of New York, all denying appellant appeal in Forma Pauperis and hearing and new evidence in Forma Pauperis, respectively.

The Court of Appeals denial of forma pauepris and dismissal of appelant's actions are entered in the clerks' offices on the 25th of June, 1981, and the U.S. District Court: 29th of June, 1981.

The docket numbers for the Court of Appeals is as follows:

- DIAL PRESS and OLGA LEY - 81 - 7245
- HARPER & ROW PUBLISHERS - 81 - 7243
- ST. MARTIN'S PRESS et al - 81 - 7253

The index numbers fvor the U.S. Dostroct Court are as follows:

- DIAL PRESS and OLGA LEY - 81 - 1405
- HAPER & ROW PUBLISHERS - 81 - 1404
- ST. MARTIN'S PRESS et al - 81 - 1401

Copies of the above noted facts are annexed herein.

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT belongs in this C ourt because appellant has never been heard on any issue in any COMPLAINT in any lower court. The issues of fact are extremely serious,

so much so, that each and every life everywhere on eqrth is affected by said issues when known, comprehended and disseminated, but with denials at all stages without facts read, or heard or judged on their merits, with pre-disposed biases and prejudices helad fast and abbtinately, no one can know and beneifit from the right to know, from the legal right to be heard, and the moral right to have progressive human advaznccements to be unrestrained unduly. Certainly, the law allows for forma pauperis, that no one may denied due process, and certainly, the law allows for a litigant, a plaintiff, to rest her case, to be ruled on the issues in the COMPLLINT, and to be allowed technical evidence to support arguments, all of which were denied respectively in each of the above-ttield actions, among a host of other denials unwarranted and unjust in every resepext. This Court stands to uphold the rights of the individual, the rights of the individual plaintiff, herein, have been denied at all times, and, admittedly, on record, for pro se prejudice, for personal attachments, and for predisposed bias and belief without Ground from familiar, traditional concepts and practices without hearing new and unfamiliar concepts and practices, respectively; history is replete with the remote and unusual circumstances from which innovation appears, found to be the milestones in human advancements, culturally, industrially, etc., and in each case, it is the I N D I V I D U A L , free and unfettered who innovates and set forth original works; and, ironically, is is only becasue plaintiff is just an "INDIVIDUAL" unaffiliated, in personal appearance, that is the basis for all denials in all c ourts; it is the very heart of our laws of the land, of the aspirations of our founding fathers, the fundamental aim of our Delcaration of Indepencdence and Constitution, to protect the rights of the individual and herein it is the rights of the individual that have been violated in every respect, and it remains for this Court to hear the facts of issue in all of the original records in the lower courts; from a legal and from a human, humane and humanness standpoint, this court is obliged to appellant's JURIDISDCITONAL STATEMENT, professionally and, even, personally, in the wholesome attitude that life, one's own, as well as those to whom this court is responsible, is precious and each one has the right to know, to know new, original, proper programs.

CITATION OF OPINIONS BELOW

There are NO OPINIONS in any lower court in the instant appeal, and none ever delivered on the facts of issue at any time, and, in fact, the record shows that plaintiff-appellant's BRIEFS were not even read by the lower courts on almost all occasions, proven by the unfamiliarity of appelalnt's titles unknown to the lower court and the fact of legal right of valid ownerhsiop of oopryright submitted over and over and not known to the cbanta; judgements made were made without reference to the facts in the record and no reference to them ever made at any time by any bench. The effort at silencing and enying applellant's rights were even carried to the point of demanding remittance from appellant for defendant's demand for Examination Before Trial of astronomical and unwarranted sums by multi-million -dollar organizations from a solitary, independent innovator; thus exerting an act of cruelty upon a constructive contributor to society, known to be so when the highly/and restictive reputable and esteemed NEW YORK ACADEMY OF MEDICINE at Fifth Avenue and 103rd Street in New York City who do not accept new works lightly nor from non-medical professionals but for the contents of highly worthy attention for constructive enlightenment to all, yet the lower courts would transcend their non-professional judgements without any hearing of any of the facts in any of the COMPLAINTS, and not entering any opinion anywhere on said facts of issues at any time.

JURISDICTON

Appellant has exerted all efforts in all aveenues as required by procedure and law; appellant has been denied appeal in Forma Pauperis, new evidence allowed by law, and any hearing of the contentions where erroneous entries have been denied corections, in appeal and in Motion for Hearing on the facts. Let this Court note representstive examples of the facts of the works and the facts of issues denied in all the lower courts for no other reason than they are unfamiliar and contrary to prevailing concepts and practices, a prime element of originality.

QUESTION PRESENTED

On theoccasion of one instance where appellant and the opposition counsel appeared before Magistrate Sinclair in the U.S. District court, defense attorney stated in reply to Magistrate Sinclair's qeustion on settlement, was that no offer of settlement was made soley because plaintiff-appellant is pro se; there was an understood addmittance of violation of appellant's copyright rights, the facts plainly self-evident in the most cursory obserbation by any person; there was open admission by one bench of pro se prejudice; there has been admission on record of personal association of an intended expert witness,, and the list of events is seemingly countless of such parallel happenings to appellant's rights merely because appellant is without independent means finanacially but indpendent and constructively contributaory to society however unafiliated and promoting such constructive works on solitary afforts on nothing more than persoal convcition professional worth and abundant energy - until injured purposely due to the untraditioal original program by appellant; the questón, therefore, shal such events be permitted to continue to the detriment of the publci at large when the founding fathers foresaw such facts of society that individals innovate and promote social welfare and advanceent, that those rights granted by the founding fathers be denied for the circumstance of being independent without indpendent means and the powers formidable powers of the benches and lower courts be allowed to run rapant over t e right vof the indvidual, whose rights invade the wide fiedls of society whereinall are affected, or shall the individual innovator bave and be protected by this Court as warranted in all laws of theland and state laws as well bue denied?

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS INVOLVED

ARTICLE 1, Section 8, Clause 8

STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

UNITES STATES CODE ANNOTATED, Title 17, Section 101

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The foregoing, documented facts in all te records, are those of the procedureal processes, the denial of the right to be heard, denial of due process, violation of civil rights in being denied equal dispensation of the law, in beind deneid being heard, of the facts of issue ignored, of denial of forma pauerpis, of bias and prejduice against personal appearance, admiittedly in the record of transcript, in the actions of opposition counsels, and in the cruel exertion of ppowers of position upon the hapelss ec onomically deprived innovaytor, independent, free, unfettered, to innozate and punished just for being without independent means and unafilliated.

As serious and signifcant the above-cited deprivation of civil, legl, human and moral rights are, more serious and more sigificant is the drprivation of the very heart of the whole matter, the meaning to human existance and human knowledge, far beyond the right to know and theprotection of the innovator to ddisseminate the new works, maintaining their integrity and worth, in originaliyy and original worth yo all.

The heart of the whole matter is also the heart of the statgement of the case, intricately involved in the cited erprivations.

The facts take in a host of other facts of human innovation; example, there are no wheels in nature, yet mankind condiders the wheel man's greatest invention; the first source of energy is obvious and overlooked; exploration of sapce is universally accepted as the modern frontier of new worlds, while the exploration of space within the world of the individua; vehicle, the human b ody remains unnoted and unimportant in searches for solutions; the transference of immutab le principles in nature used in animated material substances is not comprehended nor considered for animate material substance as the human body, etc.

Appellant's original works, TENSION-in-REPOSE, is that void in human relevance, exploration, application and innovation of the transittance in practical form those principles without which no exploration of space beyond the earth's atmosphere could take place, why the wheel is not such a "Great invention" for human consumption,

why it leads man down the garden path to a dead end, why it does not exist in nature, what does exist that is Great and Greatest of all established techniques in nature for maximal efficienty of any object, how this affects each and every individual, that whatever the power of position and learnedness of any human being, each and every human being is sbbject to the immutable, unchanging forces in nature in the universe, that the search for solutions is limited to compelxities of details whn the G R A N D D E S I G N does begging for its simkplicity and common ground for all solutions, the Greater including the lesser, the details blending into the first force in natuee, and not blending wit out the presence of the first force, etc.

From such factors and more, inherent in appellant's original TENSION TENSION-in-REPOSE system tangible and irrefutable in conceptualzie precepts, a domino effect takes place wherein the most elusive searches find a direction and even resolution, among which is conclusive proff of Einstein's finding that there is no Gravity, that the current and counter-current of the oeceas - water and air - form that delicate balance in the universe that provides surcease for human anatomy and personality.

To cite an example of a long search, for human welfare, how the wheel is made to look utterly primitive and far from Great in its inventiveness, are obvious yet overlooked facts that pertain to the efficiency of physical performance through all ages.

It is a known fact that bones stop Grwoing at about age 20; it is a known fact that soon after the mid-section of the body in the main torso, the waistline, expands, popularly known as a "spare tire" or the "pot belly" blamed on "beer" , "food", etc; it is commonly known that human height decreases with the passing decades, and the medical records record this fact with such titles as THE BIOLOBIC AGES OF MAN, showing first stages of life, childhood, young adulthood, middle age and old age, the over-all line portraying the height of human upright stance reaching a crest and diminsihking thereafter, declining in height and efficiency; this is accepted as having to be so.

Yet, it is also known that ALL LIFT STEMS FROM THE CONCAVE CURVE; it is known that living cells that die assume a convex curve.

off, without the employment of the concave curve in deign, most well-known in jet planes, the concave curve being the common ground, master blueprint, for all other diversified designs.

No living human being ever uses the concavecurve for lift to the body which lifts the spirit, all very tangible and actual, literally and figurativ ely.

All traid tional designs, systems and programs for enhancing human anatomy is within the dying line of convex curves, that is bending bakward just at the well-known lordotice weakness of the human back only to accentuate it more and weakne it more; when the convex curve in not in play in human affairs and exhortations, straight lines from the direct command of the will and mental exertion are forced on the human bdoy.

Appellant's original TENSION-in-REPOSE DESIGNS engage the exact opposite direction, using designs that bring the body forward, having the middle of the back weakness, convex curve disappear altogehter along with the cervical convex curve, creating a smooth unbroken line wf the concave curve; the effect follows the well-known snowfalls where each designs is individual, different, diversified, yet all have in common the spiral pattern.

All traditional systems avoid the concave-spiral patterns worse than the plague - until the original, entirely idfferent deisngs originated by appellant have been seen tor produce unprecedented results from the inception of the first publication in 1961 publication WHY YOU SHOULD NOT EXERCISE sub-titled "Weightlessness For Earthlings". The PHYSICAL lift inherent in the concave curve created andunprececented buoyancy in the human body without exception and regareless of dispositon of any body, firm, infirm, whole or handicapped.

TENSION-in-REPOSE showed Einstein's finding that gravity is so weak is is non-eixstent, that what lies in the delcine of the human upright posture in later years is a matter of lack of counterpoise, of void of countercurrent as in the oceans of air and water for true, delicate balance.. The root element in the delicate balance of the T-in-R system is the fact of PRESSURE, the major factor in the constitutency of the make-up of the atom.

sithout internal, qqualized, spatial pressures to make foom for the vital orgaans and their functioninGs in the bqy, the body cannot achieve its maximal potential, not in efficiency and not in its true life-sapn, known by all professionals to be more than the current four-score, that the intrinsic bleuprint of the body is for 150.

No traditional system that engaGes the dying force of convex curves, or straiGht lines or forced exertions of the will upon the body, the body that is a produce of the millennia and the so-called "intelliGence" of homo sapiens but aone-minute old an Geologic time and cnnaot beGin to match the wisdom of the aGes in the wisdom of the Body which is a product of the aGes. The forceeful apposition of the contrived devisementments of mental andwill forced proGrams in addition to diametricLly opposite facts of nature that weaken the weak part of the body by forcinG it to move in convex backward lines and directions can never provide any remote hope for enhancancinG the body's welfare.

It is corumon practice all overyhe world and attitude that it does not matter how the body moves, al lonG as it moves; appellant's T-in-R proGram holds that it does matter how the body moves in what initial desiGn it is made to move, and that desiGn for the livinG body has an equal importance for deiGn in ono-livinG entities

All defendants herein have directly copies exactly appellant's oriGinal desiGns that are entirely contrarty to traditional practices and systems, that appellant's oriGinal desiGns and traditionals systems of desiGns and patterns are incompatible, yet, each havinG rejeceed all of appellant's oriGinal mansucirpts, have taken those same desinhs presented to them in the inteGirty of context, precepts and harmony of contents from those defndant-publishers an their authors who have deliberately placed the contradictory deiGns within the covers of the their pulciations, the leaves of their paGes facinG each other with the self-evident contrdadcitions and self-evident copyinG from appellant's oriGinal works.

In the matter of defendant Dial Press and Beck Ley, the bench had noted inpre-trial procedures that there was "similarity", in her "opinion" there was the Groos error of ascribing concave design to defendants and convex to plaintiff-appellant, and a long list of incorrect assertions not in the record, etc. yet the right to make corrections, the acknowledgement that appellant was denied the right to rest the case, have expert witnesses, technical facts, etc. were all denied and the Appeals court affirmed y e lower court and the Brief by appellant was never read in the Appeals court.

In the matter of defendant Harper & Row, appellant's initial COMPLAINT was ignored entirely, testimony was ignored entirely from the defendant's authors, from appellant's expert witness, etc. as well as denial of self-evident facts admitted to in pre-trial procedures, during which the bench was led to believe that one witness was paid by defendant, and then admitted that an expected expert was a personal friend of the bench; but all of appellant's arguments were never acknweoldged in any form.

In the matter of defendant St. Marbin's Press & Sidi Hessel, there was admittance of rejection of appellant's original manuscript, not once, but twice, def. author could not tell the direction which the nose takes in pointing towards the umbiclical center, the bench denied scientific support for appellant's arguments. etc.

The point is that no human being can be expected to absiorb and assimilate that which is entirely new, unfamiliar, not even an Einstein or da vinci couldbe expected not to judge or know without at least have the facts before them and the arguments that support them, and that time and attention is required whatever the astuteness of the individual observing and studying them, but appellant was denied all such simple, obivous, logical formats as observations, time, attention and acknwoeldgement of facts as they are presented.

New evidence which is afforded any litigant under the law was denied appellant in the matter of each of the named defendants; in the matter of Dial Pres with the G ross wrongly stated facts of concave and convex dsigns that are a matter of life and death direction to any living body, appellant was denied

record staightened when all the other avenues were denied after new evidence was denied and there was no ackwneoldgement of the denial of the right to rest the case, thus the matter was never heard at all and with the denial of new evidence and the right to make coreections of wrong assertions contrary to the record shows that appellant's rights were violated in every respect.

The bench in St. MartiN's Press matter made it emienently oovious that he was just going through motions of proecdures with a sharp cutting edge to appellant's efforts. He literally made his own statement that there is just so many designs possible in the way a body moves which is correct in terms of convex cvurves which is traiditonal in traditional systems and fadliar programs, but is not a fact in appelalNt's origiml systems and designs that engage a concave curve entirely contrary to tradditonal paractices and whthin which there are NO LIMITATIONS to designs, just as there are no two snowflakes alike of all the snowfella that ever fell or to fall yet anywhere in e world.

Appellan has had to contend with a long list of biases and prejudces, the prejduice of pro se appearance, the bias of pre-disposed motions attendant upon traidtional systems and not attendant upon appellant'soriginal designs, appellant's independent status, unaffilaiated, penniless, against the power of the multimillion dollar pbulsihers, the profit-making authors from the original works of the innovator without qualm, unabashedly stealing said works that should embarass them with their countermanding the ve ry programs they esposuse in traditional designs but having learned the commercial value of the effects of the unprecdented original works by appellant after more than 20 years of selfsustaining inherent merits of the T-in-R system, purloin the works by appellant without have any grasp or comprehension of what they have usurped.

AT no time was there ever any ground within the familiar systems or defendants' arguements for the presence of appellant's original works; none could understand, explain or justify their presenc

There is no denying the prevalent predilection of the human attitude that human intelligence sprouts an attitude of egocentricity, a result of which is thst those laws of nature that

are familiar in mechanical inventions and uses are not part of human factors of life and living within the body itself, that the human body is beyond such deviecs in nature, that the human being is not subject to the same inconrtovertible, unassialabel and unchanging princples and laws in nature, and the lower courts would not Grant appellant the civil right and the simple right to demonsrate how they work applied to human structure of the body and how they matter ina life and death direction within design.

Aopellant's first publicaton center fold displayed the soalar system, the Earth, the atom, the human body, and the wheel, the wheel in a General outline of the pattern of the solar system in that it has a center hub and spokes between the rim and nub that move without further exertion or effort, the nub the source of motion, the rim, periphery, the series of concave curve, but with the wheel it is in flat dimension, andwith the Earth and Solar system and the Atom it is three-diemsional, in perfect balance, the Earth is weightless, internal pressure in the atom equalized in the balance of the univesr, the agent to effect a vaccuum, a vacuum which is known to preserve, and the list is long of the series of domino effects when going in the right direction, the right direction being the concave curve; Chief Jus ice Olivdr Wendell Holmes stated in his writings that "DIRECTION IS 95 PERCENT OF WORK CONE, and in appellant's original works and designs, the Goodd Justice's insight and perception can be literally trnaslated, for with the concave curve, there is self-Generated movements and room for internl functionings without impeidment providing room for free movement for each organ and connections within the self-cotained form f the sphere to make complementary exchanges for harmonious unifed actions among all.

Appellant reads into Chief Holmes words the embodiment of the ppurpose of the court system and the laws therein for the promotion of human exchanges in accord with the rights of liberty in biological and human fundamentals to be free and reposnbile for one's self and for others in society. Defendants surely would deny such respoisnbility and the lower courts ceny appellant the right tobe heard for all concerned, includin. defndants' own welfare.

The forces of truth and justice, however delayed, still are mot suppressed and surface despite the deceptions by defendants.

The denial of the right to be heard by the lower courts protracts defendants' deceptions, but does not change the facts on record.

Appellant appelas to this Court on the basis of the original records wherein each and every contention made by appellant is upheld by fact, facts of issues and facts of violation of individual rights, civil rights and Constitional rights granted to the innovator.

It stands to reason that denying the indpendent indivial such rights is a loss to more than the plaintiff; it is aloss to all at large; appellant has been deli erately injuried with the cause stemming from untraditional concepts and original program T-in-R that is contrary to familiar practices, so appellant has had to undergo life-tnetning injury, puloinment of toil, blood seat and tears arduous labors without aid or assistance, living in all manner of ceprivation while defendants profit largely from appellant's works and denied justice in the courts in addition to injury, stolen works and tneir consdquences. Under such a regimenno one profits in the long run, for it means assulting and halting works of the contructive individual to the detriment of the depriver as well as the recipients.

(With th treatened postla strike for midnight today, appellant hastens to complete the instant writing as much as possible, but relies mostly on the documentef facts in the original records that support all of appellant's arguentns.)

Annexed herein are representaaive examples of appellant's works, brief description of the facts in the above-titled actions, the portent of appellant's TENSION-in-REPOSE precepts for the body and for wide fields of endeavor beyond the contemporary discoveries and beyond imaination of any fiction, adhering entirely to facts, establshed and unassociated heretorfore.

The facts of issue are every individual's resonsibility, including each of the defendants and their represnttatives. Without the focus of the reverence for life as these matters involve, no one's life can be protected properly biologically nor legally.

THE QUESTOON PRESENTED IS SUBSTANTIAL

However difficult it may seem to comprehend the arguments of the unfamiliar, the independent indep3ndent, the unaffiliated, free andunfettered innovator, there is too much that is too serious to leave any stone unturned; it is incoumbent upon this Court when all others have disregarded such funda,entals of the individual rights to be heard, to have equal dispenstion of the law, etc, as cited earlier, to take up the matters herein for everyone's sake; without doing so, neither can any memberof this Court evergain any possibility of benefitting from the unprecedonted works originated by appellant; this Court is in lieu of the dark ages practices that victimed such innovators as Galileo who was threatend with the powers of the Inquisition if he did not recant; under the circumstances, he had no choice and the life helived enabled him to make further disoveries; to deny appellant the right to her own works, from wich physical injuries have already taken place because of them, not unlike the threat to Gelileo for his untraditional presentat ons, appellant is subjected to like prctices of the dark ages and the ogotues of the Inquisiton in contempoary forms of such torments and theat to life; only appellant's own works have enavled herto ambulate at all, no medical program in existence to contend with the special circumstnaces of the two injuries and the lack of medical knowledge of the main joints of the body, the jaw joints and the pelvis with the unprecedented circumstance so childhood surgical intervtion that no professional could handle profesionally; the c hief gift of nature, da Vinci said, is the gift of liberty; the chief gift of our Constittuion is also that of liberty with the purusit of life if not happiness, to protect and preserve it; it is not wise to silence the contributor and appellant looks to this court to practice fundamentl wisdom, to let the facts be heard at last and at least.

CONCLUSION

THE FACTS OF ISSUE, THE QUESTION PRESENTED IN THIS APPEAL ARE MORE THAN SUBSTANTIAL: THEY ARE FORMIDABLE AND SIGNFICANT NATIONALLY AND INTERNATONLI

Dated: July 20, 1981
New York, N.Y.

Respectfully submitted,

Millicent Linden
500 East 74th Street
New York, N.Y. 10021

THE LADDER

E-X-T-E-N-D-I-N-G within A R C H I N G



Life came from the sea and slowly conquered the land, always ascending in form and defying gravity.

The most profound skeletal changes in the upward trend occurred when we went from a four-legged to a two-legged mode of locomotion.

The adaptation of the human body to the requirements of the upright posture, although not perfect, is well blocked out. The fundamental adjustments have already been achieved.

If man continues to exist, he will continue to evolve. The forces that wrought the present status have not abdicated their functions.

Any improvement in man's adaptation in the ladder of life, in the constant defiance of gravity, would help characterize future man.

Man, who has learned to control the elements around him and to fashion his own culture, can also take over the function of directing his skeletal evolution by taking small steps toward a more erect posture. Though it be but a small degree, even as much as a grain of sand, it would be at his

OF LIFE - THE EVOLUTIONARY LIFT

ALL LIFT STEMS FROM THE CONCAVE CURVE

direction; and he would be exploring the inner spaces of his own physical home—his body—as well as taking up the exploration of the outer spaces around his home.

The TENSION-in-REPOSE special stretches improve on the present adaptation of the human skeleton because they contribute toward a more erect posture in a naturally free and flexible manner. Since they are themselves evolutionary in their development of the body—through nature's own laws—man may reach a little more for the stars while still walking the earth.

The skeletal drawing next to man's present posture depicts the more erect position achieved through the special stretch of Tension-in-Repose.

ANGULATION OF SACRUM IN ANGULATION OF ENCIRCLING CONCAVE CURVE INVOLUNTARILY STRAIGHTENS SPINE.



CONCAVE: ARCHING RESISTS AND BALANCES THE INWARD-DOWNWARD TUG PROVIDING COUNTERPOISE & LIFT

The concave curve turns inward; everything lies within the concave curve; everything turns itself inward.
All diversity lies within the concave curve; all developments of diversities occur within the concave curve
Balance is restored by the lift in and of the concave curve; the concave curve is stronger than gravity.
All forms are initially predicated upon concave curves and triangles. SPACE-ESSENCE OF PRESSURE. containment
Forms & pressures respond to each other within the spatial properties and within the curved frame of

YOUR BODY AS A SOLAR SYSTEM

"You will be moving from your inner core, like the center of a circle or wheel, the nucleus of an atom or the sun in the solar system, from inward-outward."



"Composite movement is that which, in addition to moving from its position, also moves round its axis, as the movement of a wagon wheel or other similar things."



"If you set your legs a fourteenth part as to take a fourteenth part from your height, and you open and raise your arms until you touch the line of the crown of the head with your middle fingers, you must know that the centre of the circle formed by the extremities of the outstretched limbs will be the navel, and the space between the legs will form an equilateral triangle."

- As Vitruvius after Vitruvius

The Atom

"Earth is analogous to the human body with its veins containing blood and its wind pipes containing breath."

MAN AND HIS WORLD FALL SOMEWHERE BETWEEN THE TWO – THE SOLAR SYSTEM AND THE ATOM."

(Excerpted from:
WHY YOU SHOULD NOT EXERCISE
"Weightlessness for Earthlings"
Millicent Linden 1961)

500 EAST 77th STREET • NEW YORK, N. Y. 10021
MILLICENT LINDEN, Director
(212) 988-0515

THE BIOLOGIC AGES OF MAN FROM CONCEPTION THROUGH OLD AGE

Second Edition



QT
104
S645b
1978
2d ed.

SMITH—DIERMAN—ROBINSON

W. B. SAUNDERS COMPANY

I M M U T A B L E F O R C E S & P R I N C I P L E S

INHERENT IN

T - E - N - S - I - O - N - i n - R - E - P - O - S - E

by

Millicent Linden

- Self-evident facts proving Einstein's finding there is NO GRAVITY
- Asronomers' incorrectly ascribing gravity as the curving agent of substance in the Galaxies
- The effect of wrongful assumptions and presumptions of Gravity upon the human form and human problems
- The direct relevancy and pertinent to plaintiff's original TENSION-in-REPOSE system and its infringement
- The F I R S T S O U R C E O F E N E R G Y - THE SPIRAL, its innerent properites
- Self-evident clue from nature of the biological action of contraction and expansion - MIMOSA PLANT
- CONTRACTION & EXPANSION - physics and physiology of STRETCHING
- TENSION-in-REPOSE v. traditional, familiar conditioning T-in-R entirely"something new under the sun"
- T-in-R principles assemblage & formula of the simplicity underlying the field of unification
- Stuctural design the basis of chemistry (drugs) taking precedence over shemistry (drugs)
- Honey & carbolic acid made up of same ingredients, arrangement & proportion differences
- Carbon and diamonds same ingredient - pressure difference
- Arrangement, proportion, pressure hinging on initial design affecting efficiency of human anatomy
- Unprecedented science of ALIGNMENT-conforming forces of evolution; "mind" no substitute for physic of physiology

- The Earth is a SPHERE and W E I G H T L E S S spinning independently on its own axis and dependently around the sun in a pattern of delicate balance

- Facts of the Weightless SPHERE fomr basis of the ultimate sensuous, sexual sensations

- Columbus' and Galileo's discoveries, the roundness of the Earth and the Earth's revolving around the center of its source-design, sphere in spherical pattern, remain unexplored for application to human anatomy

- Angulation inherent in the principle of the lever permeates all motion & exists in the minutests details of the sphere

- Angulation the basis for harmony or dissonance in the body

- Angulation in harmony inherent in the CONCAVE curve, the ever-present pattern in the spiral, the spiral the unchanging, constant support for all the uncountable diversities in all things everywhere

- Angulation in dissonance in the CONVEX curve without the foundation of the concave design promulgated in historical and contemporary traditional systesm

- Concave-convex discrepancies the basis why diets don't work

- TENSION-in-REPOSE displacing undue effort with multiple motion in unison releasing physical self-generated functions involuntarily promoting cell efficiency

- BALANCE the first consideration and force in all matter gross balance, delicate balance, no balance

- ALL LIFT STEMS FROM THE CONCAVE CURVE - the concave curve the foundation of true balance, true relaxation

- The spine assumes the spherical form of the concave curve during the orgasm - precision-pressure-weightless-

- TENSION-in-REPOSE is the orgasm in slow motion andindependent of any external agent- precision-pressure-weightless

- INNER SPACE, equalized pressure within the hollowing form of the concave curve, for delicate balance the ultimate frontier of space "You can have neither a greater nor less dominion than that over yourself" - LENOARDO DA VINCI - NOTEBOOKS

- Animaml-concave arching seen as meancing rather than resort to strength, forward bend, doubling over in concave form seen as matter of pain not restoration to harmony spherical concave slumping form seen as bad posture not as the root source and foundation of progression in the constant ascent in the history of life on earth

- There are no wheels in patyre- wheel considered man's greatest invention

A GLIMPSE OF PRO SE PREJUDICE & WHOLESALE INJUSTICE

Index No. 30786/74 — CIVIL COURT OF THE CITY OF N.Y.
MILLICENT LINDEN v. NATHAN NOVICK — Judge David Stadtmauer

Under oath, on the witness stand, defendant admits to not ordering X-rays after he says he suspects a fracture, does not mobilize the suspected site, does a test calling for active movement rather than immobilization of fracture site, openly admits to twisting knee and making pelvis go out of alignement. Full trial court days: August 14,17,27,1974; Judge Statdmauer ruled for defendant writing he followed prevailing standard practices; the decision was entered in the record before 10:00 am the next day by the clerk

All appeals affirmed lower court.

Index No. 1082/76 — CIVIL COURT, CITY OF NEW YORK
MILLICENT LINDEN v. NATHAN A. SHORE — Judge Lester Evens

Expert witness, Dr. Joseph J. Marbach, director jaw joint and facial pain clinic, Columbia Presbyterian Hospital, testifies under oath treatment to the jaw joint, severe spasms, inability to open mouth, identifies X-rays by defendant just before dislocation of jaw joint, and X-rays right after injury, describes injection into the jaw joint in severe spasms.

Judge Evens dismises the case on the grounds the expert witness made "NO DIAGNOSIS WHATSOEVER"

All appeals affirmed the lower court

Index No. 3568/75 — New York State Supreme Court transferred to Civil Court
MILLICENT LINDEN v. NATHAN NOVICK

New evidence, new action. New lawyers for defendant; first ones refused to represent him. New Lawyers, David Fox, Samuel Graff, ISAACSON, ROBUSTELLI, FOX & GRECO, submit a false court order to strike the case from the calendar and engage in a long list of violations and breaking of the law; Judge Seymour Schwartz tells pro se plaintiff to "GO TAKEUP SOME RELIGION, LAWYERS GOT TO LIVE" The false court order never acknwoeldged, the case never restored to the calendar.

Index Nos. 42789/77; 77-7162; 16658/80; 48027/81; M-1512
N.Y.State Supreme Court; Second Circuit Appeal; Civil Court Appellate Term; Appellate Division;(Albany Appeal)
MILLICENT LINDEN v. DAVID FOX and SAMUEL GRAFF

Defendants, lawyers, submit false court order; Judge Postel stated he had not ruled on their Motion to strike Novick action off the calendar Judge Manuel Gozmez writes pl. may have more than one cause of action against defendants who are lawyers; Judge Charles Greenfield writes pl. seeks re-instatement of action against doctor known not to be a lawyer; Judge Helen Freedman writes Judge Gomez said there was no cause of action,

that Judge Charles Greenfield also said so alone with Judge Lasker none of which statements are to be found in any court records; Appellate Term denies Forma Pauperis Appeal, Appellate Division alleges "lack of jurisdiction" despite unassailable fact all parties are within the New York County, 2nd Circuit never read pl.'s Brief, Albany alleges issues on record "unappealable".

Index No. 3685/74 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHER DISTRICT OF N.Y. Judge Constance Baker Motley

MILLICENT LINDEN v. DIAL PRESS and OLGA LEY · copyright infringeme

- Plaintiff given pre-trial order at second of trial
- Pl. denied wignesses agreed upon pre-trial & present
- Pl. denied examination of def.-author present
- Pl. denied technical evidence-scientific facts
- Pl. allotted 2 hours limit for trial told day before
- Pl. denied rebuttal to def. motion to dismiss
- Pl. denied right to rest the case
- Judge Motley ascribes concave and convex designs wrongly, the main contention of the COMPLAINT.
- Judge Motley refuses to make correction
- Judge Motley had refused to recuse herself having tacityly admitted pro se prejudice
- Judge Motley had to akk pl. to find legally drawn copyright valid ownership in pl.'s brief she never read
- Judge Motley had noted "similarities" in def.'s copied designs from plaintiff's original works in earlier opinion denied in ruling for def.
- Judge Motely had denied preliminary injuction on the grounds it would be hardship for multi-million-dollar organization-defendant-publisher, but no regard for solitary, unmonied originator with no aids of any kind for efforts that reached around the world, across the nation

Second Circuit never read pl.'s Brief on Appeal; none recognized even the titles of pl.'s books. Pl. denied new action with new evidence

Index NO. 1435/75 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT; SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF N.Y.: Judge Vincent Broderick

MILLICENT LINDEN v. HARPER & ROW PUBLISHERS

- Expert witness: Dr. Abelardo Paseiro, ass8stant director, Physical Medicine, St. Vincent's Hospital def.'s authors - physical therapists
- authors acknwoledge they did not originate the infringed upon design, in affidavit and in testimony
- source research material cited by authors far removed from purloined design, noted by the bench during verbal testimony-giving false description
- expert witness, pl.'s, testifies no physical therapist can use any system without prescription
- expert witness, Dr. Paseiro, pl.'s, states he is not familiar with pl.'s original designs and would not prescribe them without medical study
- authors both admit cannot perfomr the designs they stol
- authors allege what they cannot perform physically as physical therapists, they expect stroke patients, paraplegics, accident victims, paralysis, etc.to do s
- Def.'s own witness, supervisor of student therapists, admits none come with knowledge of stolen design and no known program includes it in their curriculum
- ICD chief physical therapist, Ted. Corbett, former Olumpic contender, E.24th St. NYC, carried on study with student therpaists at ICD, average age 21, and older nurses, patients, etc., none of whom could perform pl.'s original, purloined design, admits notarized statements of tests on witness stand

- All technical, scientific facts in evidence support pl.'s claims
- Valid ownership of copyright acknowledged by the co
- Design infringed upon published first in 1961, reprinted 1963,67,68; added dimension 1971
- Def.'s infringing pulbication 1968
- Def.'s previous publication without infriggement-19
- Pl.'s COMPLAINT pertaining to 1961 through 1968
- Judge Broderick rules for Def. on grounds that 1971 design with intermediate staging presented for improved comprehension is design arrived at independently by def.-authors
- Def.'s publication dated 1968 could not qwualify as infringement as it appears after def.'s book published in 1968, which is before pl.'s 1971 publication of an extension of the 1961 - 1968 initial, original design still intac
- Second Circuit gave no opinion in affirming lower court, following pattern of never giving any opinion in any of pl.'s appeals.

Index No. 1914/79 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK: Judge Milton Pollack

MILLICENT LINDEN v. ST. MARTINS PRESS and SIDI HESSEL

- Pl. denied any and all scientific, technical data by the court for and during trial
- The court denied relevant descriptions by pl. without inquiring into connections
- Def. publ. admits in testimony having rejected pl.'s original manuscripts twice, 1963,194 producing file record of correspondence
- Def. author was asked the direction the head would take if the nose were pointed towards the umbilical center, the navel-the court interrupted defe's reply after she said that it dependend upon where one was standing and the court continued to deny pl. further questoning after explaining that the direction was directly pertinent to the infringement of design, that concave direction is diametrically opposite convex and the difference is manifest in results
- During the charge to the jury, Judge Pollack told them that there is a limit of design for body movement; pl. objected, the court made no correction saying that the jury was to decide that but the court presented the court's decision and with it the unmistakeable bias and prejudice deeming the whole matter firvolous, saying say in his opinion and demanding that pl. defray court costs and defense attorney's demand for $439.00 for EBT despite pl.'s proceeding in Forma Pauperis; the Second Circuit never made a ruling on pl.'s motion right up to this date though it has been two years
- Second Circuit affirmed lower court (accessibility had been admitted by all - unanimously)
- Def.'s infringing publication-1978 from pl.'s 1961-1971
- Def.-author extrapolated almost all of pl's.texts and paraphrased mot of the text and copied designs line-by-line, even to size of sketches
- Pl. denied new action with new evidence
- Following usual patterns, no discussionof issues anytime

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

81-1425
McMahon

PRO SE

Second Circuit

6/23/81
81-7245

At a Stated Term of the United States Court of Appeals, in and for the Second Circuit, held at the United States Court House, in the City of New York, on the 25th day of June, one thousand nine hundred and eighty-one.





81-7245

Millicent Linden,

Appellant,

v.

Dial Press & Olga Ley,

Appellee.

A motion having been made herein by Appellant pro se for leave to proceed in forma pauperis,

Upon consideration thereof, it is

Ordered that said motion be and it hereby is DENIED and the appeal is dismissed.

WILFRED FEINBERG, Chief Judge

IRVING R. KAUFMAN

WALTER R. MANSFIELD, Circuit Judges

WF IRK WRM

A TRUE COPY
A. DANIEL FUSARO, CLERK

PRO SE
6/23/81
81-7243

Second Circuit

81-1404
McMAHON

At a Stated Term of the United States Court of Appeals, in and for the Second Circuit, held at the United States Court House, in the City of New York, on the 25th day of June, one thousand nine hundred and eighty-one.

81-7243



Millicent Linden,

Appellant,

v.

Harper & Row Publishers, Inc.,

Appellee.

A motion having been made herein by Appellant pro se for leave to proceed in forma pauperis,

Upon consideration thereof, it is

Ordered that said motion be and it hereby is DENIED and the appeal is dismissed.

WILFRED FEINBERG, Chief Judge
IRVING R. KAUFMAN
WALTER R. MANSFIELD, Circuit Judges

WF IRK WRM

A TRUE COPY
A. DANIEL FUSARO, CLERK

FIRST CIRCUIT PANEL

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

McMahon

PRO SE
6/23/81
81-7253

Second Circuit

At a Stated Term of the United States Court of Appeals, in and for the Second Circuit, held at the United States Court House, in the City of New York, on the 25th day of June, one thousand nine hundred and eighty-one.

Millicent Linden,

Appellant,

v.

St. Martin's Press & Sidi Hessel, et al.

Appellees.

A motion having been made herein by Appellant pro se for certificate of probable cause for leave to proceed in forma pauperis, the appointment of counsel and the expenses of the United States for the reproduction of exhibits and for

Upon consideration thereof, it is

Ordered that said motion be and it hereby is DENIED and the appeal is dismissed.

Wilfred Feinberg
WILFRED FEINBERG, Chief Judge

Irving R. Kaufman
IRVING R. KAUFMAN

Walter R. Mansfield
WALTER R. MANSFIELD, Circuit Judges.

WF IRK WRM

A TRUE COPY
A. DANIEL FUSARO, CLERK
By Francis X. Gindhart